DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 665 95 CE 004 454

TITLE	Building and Using Staff Development Resources for Adult Education: A Five-Year Report: 1969-74.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D. C. Div. of Adult Basic Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	63p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Advisory Committees; Diffusion; Inservice Teacher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Projects; Regional Cooperation; *Staff Improvement; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Adult Education Staff Development Project; Region IV

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the original three-year project was to establish a comprehensive regional plan for professional staff development for teachers of disadvantaged adults in the Southeast, but the focus shifted during the following two year phase toward using these resources for disseminating the latest and best information and materials. A project dateline outlines the major activities and dates. The report outlines the roles of various State, Federal, and local institutions; the barriers the project faced; and the motivations of people and groups responsible for creating the first regional staff development project in adult basic education (ABE). The two phases of the project are discussed in terms of the six formulated objectives and outcomes. Phase 1 developed State and regionwide staff development systems and Phase 2 utilized these staff development systems as vehicles for disseminating innovative ideas and materials to ABE teachers at the local level. Major outcomes were: stronger leadership in State departments of education, university and college services for staff development in adult education, trainers for inservice personnel, planning committees, establishing written plans for each project, and obtaining technical expertise for the projects. Recommendations focus on the strengthening of services and programs. (JB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110665

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Bilingual Education Program Report

A Five-Year (1969-1974) Review

December 1974 Region IV

JUN 2

The activity reported here was performed pursuant to a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia

Building and Using Staff Development Resources for Adult Education

A Five-Year Report: 1969-1974

December 1974, Region IV
Adult Education Staff Development Project

PREFACE

A staff development and dissemination project has been funded since 1969 in Region IV (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and later Kentucky and North Carolina) by the Division of Adult Education in the U.S. Office of Education. Administered through the Southern Regional Education Board, the project has involved a variety of adult educators across the region in special demonstration projects and teacher training activities authorized in Sections 309b and 309c of the Adult Education Act of 1966.

The intent of the original three-year project was to approach from a regional viewpoint the establishment of more and better training opportunities for teachers of educationally disadvantaged adults for the Southeast and for other adult education personnel. Over the years state directors, department of education staff, participating university faculty, and local coordinators and teachers have been organized into functioning state teams. Each statewide network is different from every other one, but most share these characteristics:

1. The state director of adult education assumes the leadership role of the staff development/dissemination program in his state.
2. Adult education courses and programs now exist in at least two higher education institutions in the state, one of which is predominantly black.
3. Selected administrators and teachers from local ABE programs are available as special trainers or are active in helping to plan the state's staff development/dissemination activities.
4. In each state department, someone is designated as the staff development specialist.

5. State department area supervisors (or consultants) are actively involved in staff development and dissemination roles.
6. At least two training opportunities are offered to local program personnel each year.
7. University faculty offer credit courses within driving distance of every ABE teacher and also provide consultant services to local programs and to the state department.

From 1972-1974 the focus shifted from setting up and institutionalizing staff development resources toward using these resources for disseminating the latest and best information and materials. It was thought that a staff development/dissemination system would become a permanent part of each state's ABE program. Such a system would serve two purposes: (1) to insure that disseminators and trainers are kept up to date with current thinking and literature in adult education, and (2) to insure that teachers and coordinators receive the most recent materials and information related to their needs. This report surveys the progress made during five years and analyzes the strategies carried out to achieve project objectives.

Throughout the years several educators from outside of the project have made invaluable contributions, professionally and personally. Paul Sheats, James Dorland, Robert Luke, and Ed Easley have been consultants to most of the regional seminars and have facilitated discussions and guided the course of seminar sessions. After leaving the project, Charles Kozoll returned as a seminar consultant and as a member of the evaluation panel. James Kenney, as chairman of that panel for five years, and Irwin Jahns, another long-standing member, brought continuity and perspective to the evaluation of the project and to the panel's reports.

PROJECT PLANNING COMMITTEE

The regional project has been guided by the Project Planning Committee consisting of the directors of the adult education units of the eight states, regional HEW staff, and project staff.

Alabama	Norman O. Parker Director, Adult Basic Education		
Florida	James H. Fling Administrator, Adult and Veteran Education		
Georgia	Margaret Walker Coordinator, Adult Education	Katherine Kirkland (1969-1971)	Frazy Elrod (1972)
Kentucky	Ted Cook Director, Division of Adult Education		
Mississippi	John C. Williams, Jr. Director, Adult Education	Joe Baddley (1969-1971)	
N. Carolina	Thomas Dudley Director, Adult Services	Charles Barrett (1969-1970)	Leonard Lilley (1971-1972)
S. Carolina	J. Ken East Director, Office of Adult Education		
Tennessee	Charles F. Kerr Coordinator, Adult Education		
U.S. Office of Education	Ted Freeman Regional Program Officer	William Phillips (1969-1973)	Cecil Yarbrough (to 1969)
Project Staff	Edward T. Brown Project Director	Charles E. Kozoll (1970-1972)	
	Shelby L. Johnson Project Associate	Preston E. Torrence (1970-1972)	

PROJECT EVALUATION PANEL

James B. Kenney, Chairman
Associate to Provost
University of Georgia

Irwin R. Jahns
Professor, Adult Education
Florida State University

Charles E. Kozoll
Associate Director for
Program Development
University of Illinois

CONTENTS

PROJECT DATELINE 1

PROJECT INPUTS 7

Beginnings 7

Background 10

PROJECT STRATEGIES AND PROCESSES 17

Phase I: 1969-1972 18

Phase II: 1972-1974 20

PROJECT OUTCOMES 31

SUMMARY 47

APPENDIX A: Last Quarter Evaluation Topics 51

APPENDIX B: Final Evaluation Topics and Responses 52

APPENDIX C: Regional Project Publications, 1969-1974 57

PROJECT DATELINE

1965-69	National teacher training institutes are sponsored by federal government (OEO, BAVTE); state directors are discontent (1) inadequate number of slots, (2) no opportunity to participate in selection process, and (3) trainees not available for use in inservice.
1966	Adult Education Act passes and authorizes discretionary funds to the Commissioner for teacher training and special demonstration projects (Section 309). Fortuitous late funding and slow development of procedures establish pattern of grant awards from expiring year's funds.
1966-69	Cecil Yarbrough, Region IV Program Officer, builds regional esprit de corps through frequent visiting and occasional meetings. Encourages Region IV leaders to apply for discretionary fund grant to train their own teachers and build regional resources.
1968	Sam Hand, Florida, receives $25,000 planning grant through Nova University to support meetings of state directors and their key people to plan and prepare proposal.
1969 June	First regional staff development proposal is approved; project funded at $700,000, part teacher training, part special demonstration. Edward T. Brown is appointed project director by the Southern Regional Education Board.
1969 Summer	Seven two-week graduate credit institutes for ABE teachers and coordinators held across the region. Stipends and travel checks are distributed each Friday--a great public relations act which secures good will and reputation for SREB and the project.
1969 September	First Institute for ABE Teachers of the Blind is held in Nashville for Tennesseans.
1969 Fall	Two states hold one-day inservice workshops in several areas of the state, giving substance to the service area concept.
1969 November	First Regional Seminar, Atlanta; 12 professors and 10 state department staff participate. Dr. Paul Sheats, Dr. Charles Kozoll, and Mr. Edgar Easley are consultants. Wide differences in ideas and objectives lead Paul Sheats to suggest that seminar staff not provide information but rather establish dialogue among the groups so their own knowledge will be the input to planning and action. This will be the seminar program pattern for several years.
1969 December	Appointment of evaluation panel of seven members with Dr. James Kenney, University of Georgia, Chairman, one researcher from each state, and one adult educator from out of region. (For efficiency, the panel will be reduced to three. Dr. Kenney will serve as chairman for the duration of the project.)

1969 Christmas week. Selection of three Florida institutions completes initial affiliation of higher education institutions:

Alabama State University	Jackson State College
Auburn University	Mississippi State University
Florida A and M University	University of Southern Mississippi (Reading Center)
Florida Atlantic University	South Carolina State College
University of South Florida	University of South Carolina
Albany State College	Memphis State University
Georgia Southern University	Tennessee State University
University of Georgia	University of Tennessee-Knoxville
West Georgia College	

1969 January — Dr. Charles Kozoll and Dr. Preston Torrence join the project staff as Associate Directors. Dr. Kozoll has special responsibility with the University programs and professors; Preston Torrence is to help local programs plan and provide their own inservice training.

1970 February — Second Regional Seminar, Daytona Beach. Dr. Robert Luke joins the consultant staff to work especially with local ABE staff; Paul Sheats then works with faculty, and Edgar Easley with graduate students. Over 200 local ABE staff participate, three-fourths of them from Florida. They demand of professors some practicality in their courses and more off-campus courses. At Paul Sheats' suggestion, the seminar schedule is discarded, and the state directors are formed into a planning group with the consultants. Meetings are held at lunch and dinner to plan next session. For the next four seminars, planning sessions each evening will be scheduled.

1970 Spring — Five of the six states provide one- to three-day inservice training sessions in selected areas across the state. Project funding patterns are designed with each state--typically a group lunch is served and mileage and other meals reimbursed. One state pays each participant $5 in lieu of expenses upon registration; one state authorizes no payment. Local staff used as trainers, typically, are paid $25 or $35 per program.

1970 May — Second Institute for Teachers of the Blind is held in Nashville for regional participation. Tennessee selects participants statewide; Mississippi and Georgia send persons from areas with high concentration of blindness, and Florida and Alabama send administrator-teacher teams from their state institutions for the blind.

1970 May — Third Regional Seminar, New Orleans. Dr. James Dorland is added as a consultant to work especially with the state department staff members. The closing session is verbal reports of anticipated activity with the project the next year. These are somewhat incomplete and will set the stage for continued planning back in the state. Completion is assigned to a staff member as a responsibility (the beginning of the staff development position). Project staff will become participants in state work sessions.

1970 June — Workshop is held to train professors and state staff to continuously evaluate short duration workshops and summer institutes, to be sensitive to participant needs, and to use them for adjusting the program. Virgil Ward and Jeff A. Pyatte, consultants. Second project proposal is approved for $730,000.

1970 Summer — Ten summer institutes are held throughout the region; two in Georgia, one in Mississippi, and two in South Carolina are changed from the previous teacher training mission to one of training trainers. This is to become a primary objective in the summer institutes of all but two states.

1970 July — Kentucky and North Carolina become a part of Region IV; total number of states now is eight; total number of participating higher education institutions is 22.

Kentucky State University	Appalachian State University
Morehead State University	Elizabeth City State University
Western Kentucky University	

1970 Fall — Five of the states begin twice-annual inservice workshops offered in various areas across the state.

1971 January — One person from each state department meets in Atlanta to determine content and format of state plans outlining staff development activities, an outgrowth of the New Orleans seminar and follow-up in-state assistance from project staff. Seven of the eight eventually are designated as the staff development specialist for their states.

Leon L. Hornsby	Fern Bass
Charles Lamb	Hazel Small
Tommie Fuller	Frank Hardin
Harry Baker	

1971 February — Faculty, state department staff, and key local personnel participate in workshop on planning short-duration training sessions, especially several-day workshops and two-week summer institutes. Malcolm Knowles, consultant.

1971 Spring — All eight states hold series of area inservice training sessions for local program personnel. Kentucky does formal assessment of teacher needs, the first of six states to accomplish needs survey.

1971 May — Fourth Regional Seminar, Stone Mountain. The states decided to expand and formalize state plans for staff development and almost complete them during the session. After follow-up in the states, these will be published. Local program staff participants seem to gain some status as continuing committees for state planning and review of activities.

1971 June — Faculty, graduate students, and state department staff development specialists meet in Atlanta to discuss development of graduate programs. They suggest that university administrators (deans and instructional divisions) needed orientation to project objectives and commitments. Third project proposal is approved for $500,000.

1971 Summer — Fifteen summer institutes are held across the region. Three in Tennessee, two in North Carolina are trainer oriented. The Appalachian Adult Education Center in Kentucky train trainers in reading for the region.

1971 October — Administrators from the participating institutions of higher education meet in Atlanta to discuss the development of graduate programs in adult education and their objectives and potential. Alan Knox and William Bowden, consultants.

1971 Fall — In-state meetings of regional seminar participants continue and the concept of a state planning committee becomes established.

1972 Spring — Proposal is submitted and approved for second three-year regional project; focus on dissemination, using the established staff development network.

1972 April — Fifth Regional Seminar, Atlanta. The concept of dissemination and new project direction is introduced and discussed.

1972 June — Funds for a second three-year project are approved at $319,000.

1972 July — Shelby L. Johnson joins the staff as Project Associate; begins accumulation of information on dissemination.

1972 September — Three universities join the regional project, bringing the total of participating institutions to 25.

Alabama A and M University
University of Alabama
Florida International University

1972 December — Staff development specialists meet in Atlanta to discuss components of a dissemination system. Concept of dissemination as staff development--faculty, state staff, and local trainer resources keeping up to date--emerges.

1973 March — Project graduate students meet in Atlanta for briefing on interviewing techniques for their assignment in the project evaluation.

1973 May — Sixth Regional Seminar, Atlanta. The states almost complete the addition of dissemination roles and responsibilities to the state staff development plans. Continued in-state activity completes new plans--staff development/dissemination--published in the fall.

1973 June — Proposal for a fifth year (second year of the dissemination project) is approved at $319,000.

1973 Fall — Six universities join the project, and one ends its participation. The total of institutions is now 30.

University of Florida	North Carolina A & T University
University of North Florida	North Carolina State University
University of West Florida	Elizabeth City ended participation
East Carolina University	

1974 January — Regional workshop on techniques of dissemination; Daytona Beach. Program and experiences of the Far West Laboratory are examined for application to adult education. Concept of dissemination as a systems activity evolves and eventually results in the design of a systems chart by Shelby Johnson. James LaForest and Len Silvern will provide consultant assistance to publication in 1975.

1974 June — Seventh Regional Seminar, Atlanta. "A Dissemination Fair" at which each state shares their successful experiences with the others.

1974 July — Authorization for continued use of project funds through December, 1974 is made by Washington, primarily to complete project reports and publications and to continue disseminating activity.

1974 Fall — Kentucky State ends project participation, and Murray State joins.

1974 December — Six of the eight states provide funding (January 1-June 30, 1975) to complete a study identifying state priorities for expending state grant funds in staff development and special demonstration project activity.

PROJECT INPUTS

The most evident emphasis in the final report of a project like this would be the quantitative outcomes--the numbers of programs run, the number of individuals reached, and the systems established and maintained after initial funding ceased. Those kinds of items will certainly receive attention here, but this report will view the project in perspective of the motivations for its creation and the interactions which occurred during the subsequent five years.

This report will try to establish the relationships among historical antecedents, processes during the five years of project activity, and the outcomes of the project. Although there are no line relationships, a careful reading should reveal certain ties and crucial individuals and events. There were a number of variables at work simultaneously, including potential recipients, professionals, project staff, external forces, money, institutions, and specific programs. By being able to review the project in retrospect from the outcomes through the processes which made them possible to the inputs which began the project, one may determine what future steps can be taken, how relationships can be maintained, and what additional resources and activities can be involved.

BEGINNINGS

Directors of Adult Basic Education (ABE) in the states of Region IV (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee)--and one year later, North Carolina and Kentucky--began discussing their program development needs many years ago. Informally they fostered a sense of unity and underlined the regional nature of many ABE problems. The recognition of the need for a comprehensive regional plan for professional staff development grew out of these first discussions.

In 1965, increased amounts of federal funds became available through the Adult Education Act. These funds expanded state programs and supported a variety of teacher-training institutes, from 1965 through 1967, run nationally and regionally. These ABE institutes were intended to remedy the grave lack of trained teachers for undereducated adults. The institutes, however, drew much criticism. For one, the people trained at them were seldom available to carry out their own "back home" training. Second, their selection was made without the advisement of state directors who were in a position to know the potential leaders and to make use of their new expertise for inservice training.

At the same time, three inadequacies became apparent to the state directors: (1) uncoordinated state planning for both adult education and ABE; (2) untrained or minimally trained local teachers and supervisors working in ABE; and (3) the lack of a minimal competency base for training in adult education. Having recognized these regional problems, the state directors were ready to find a remedy.

Through the encouragement of Cecil Yarbrough, Regional Program Officer for the Office of Education, the state directors began to consider a comprehensive plan for increasing the number of opportunities for staff development in the Southeast. A $25,000 planning grant from the Adult Education Branch in the Office of Education enabled Sam Hand at Florida State University to bring together the six state directors of Region IV, key persons selected by them, and the Regional Program Officer. The product of their discussions was a three-year plan for staff development, originally authored by Wayne Myer of Tennessee. Although the anticipated federal funds were substantial, the six state directors--Norman Parker of Alabama, James Fling of Florida, Catherine Kirkland of Georgia, Ted Cook of Kentucky, Joe Baddley of Mississippi,

J. Ken East of South Carolina, and Jerry Farley of Tennessee--expected state departments of education and higher educational institutions to make cash or in-kind contributions over the three original project years.

The original intent was to set up the proposed regional project at Florida State University, but this was unacceptable to a number of persons on the planning group. A second alternative was also considered and discarded--that of basing the project within one of the state departments of education. This would have caused a number of obvious problems. An idea more feasible to everyone on the planning group was the establishment of a non-profit corporation to administer the project, but early in 1969 it became evident that a self-formed corporation was unacceptable to the Office of Education and to a few participating states. Since the planning group felt strongly that the idea for the project had merit, it then sought to locate an established and experienced regional organization to administer the project. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was approached and discussions began.

SREB was asked to administer this comprehensive effort because of its history of coordinating activities between higher educational institutions and state governments. Its association with the improvement of predominantly black institutions was also recognized. With SREB guidance, it was felt that a regional theme would be insured, enabling all states to develop comparable ABE programs, and making unique professional development facilities in any one state available to all.

Subsequently, SREB agreed to administer the project under a revised proposal. All activities were regional in scope, though a program base was established in each state through the State Department of Education and its ABE coordinator or director.

BACKGROUND

The section above relates what happened with only brief mention of why it happened. Here then is a more detailed analysis of the national and regional climate at the time of project inception, of the kinds of problems that had to be faced, and of the motivations of people and groups responsible for creating the first regional staff development project in adult basic education

General Climate

The national scene. When the project was first considered, the country was in the midst of the greatest push in history towards civil rights and economic opportunity. The Office of Economic Opportunity was very strong at the time. There was feverish effort to insure a compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Large amounts of federal money were available to help the poor and undereducated. Often attention was focused on the South. Dr. Martin Luther King was extremely active in this period, and the national media brought to the fore many negative impressions of the South.

The national ABE training institutes. From 1965 to 1967 a series of national training institutes for new leadership in ABE was held. These institutes brought together individuals with minimum experience in ABE and provided them with a basic orientation to adult education and to working with the undereducated. Although these institutes developed some ties among individuals around the country, they drew much criticism especially from state directors. They were not meeting the training needs fast enough and with enough impact. State directors had little or no input into participant selection and had little access to them after their return from an institute.

The National Council of State Directors. This group was formed in the middle 1960's through promotional activities by NAPCAE. At annual national

conventions Robert Luke and James Dorland of NAPCAE hosted state director meetings and mobilized the group to affect the directions of federal legislation and the allocation of monies which the Congress did provide for adult education. In particular, they saw that dollars were made available for special projects, including regional efforts and teacher training. At these national meetings, state directors from the Southeast increased their working relationships and developed common concerns and a level of trust.

The state directors at first were hesitant, but some of their members were more comfortable and willing to act. They all saw a great need to upgrade the quality of their personnel, so that the loss of learners and staff could be reduced. They wanted to be sure there were resources within their own states which they could influence and direct. Elements of pride and the desire to be first nationally in the development of a regional program for staff development also figured in their willingness to act.

The higher educational institutions initially were willing to act at least with the assurance of three years of federal soft money and because of their respect for and commitment to SREB. There was also a commitment to service as a result of the growth of the service area concept among the educational communities of their states. Institutional motivation, of course, was different from the individual motivations of new faculty members whose primary concern was to build a program of sufficient size and prestige to warrant permanency.

The federal government perhaps was anxious to test the viability of a regional plan so that greater gains could be made from federal monies allocated for teacher training and staff development. They were confident of the potential for cooperation among the Southeastern states because of the long history of association and activity.

SREB felt an interest in the higher educational institutions which were to be primary resources to the project. SREB also had a commitment to the traditionally black institutions and wanted to be sure that they would be represented in any activity. The final motivator in SREB's willingness to act may well have been its ties with the leadership in each of the states, both politically and educationally, and a desire to be sure that a regional project would be in harmony with its own overall program.

Barriers

Four barriers to understanding, development of trust, and growth of communication existed. These barriers were not overcome; they were eliminated. The use of money or political leverage could have produced a temporary "overcoming," but the basic elements of resistance would have remained. Eliminating resistances required consistent effort by all participants--state department staff, university faculty, local program personnel--and by project staff. More than anything else, each participating group was ignorant of operations, potential contributions, and organizational restraints of the other groups. Empathy was in short supply.

Views of the "others." Each participant group held a previously conceived impression of other groups. Ignorance, through unfamiliarity, was the single cause. There is a long list of themes which these impressions produced. Here are only a few.

1. Adult learners would be largely ineducable, given their first-time failure in education.
2. Teachers would be willing to devote only a minimum amount of time to working with learners and even less to preparation.
3. Administrators would affiliate with ABE for financial reasons only.

4. State department of education involvement would hopelessly slow down administrative and financial tasks.
5. Higher education would restrict its outreach to traditional campus credit courses, which would be more theoretical than practical.
6. SREB would remain distant and disdainful of department of education and local program ABE personnel, given its history of contacts only with higher education and state political leadership.
7. The Office of Education's funding motives could not be predicted and, even if so, could not be assumed as constant.
8. Cooperation would have largely financial overtones and truly regional efforts would be difficult since parochial state and institutional concerns would take precedence.
9. Black involvement in leadership roles would be a necessary burden, since expected contributions by individuals or institutions would be fewer than those expected of whites.

Obviously, these negative impressions were never openly or loudly advanced. They were underlined indirectly in letters and more directly in conversations and interviews. Their influence was important and of concern since the intent of the project was to build a system which would insure staff development rather than to support discrete and unrelated inservice training activities.

Lack of understanding or empathy. At the beginning, participants demonstrated a lack of awareness of the organizational environments and resulting attitudes of colleagues. It would be unproductive to cite the groups most oblivious to elements in the professional lives of their associates. Instead, one misunderstanding about each participating group will be mentioned.

1. ABE learners were initially seen as emulating younger public school students in a step-by-step progression through a set curriculum to mastery of basic skills. This progression was seen as the prime motivator, rather than the mastery of a small but immediately useful bit of learning from one subject, possibly followed by departure from the program.
2. The political influences on teachers and administrators, who were mostly part-timers, were not seen immediately. First, the element of reward for teacher performance (in or out of the classroom) through extra income earned in ABE was fairly universal in the region. Second, the critical role of superintendents to program success was not fully recognized; their ability to lend or withdraw support for activities which strengthen staff performance was not always taken into account. Third, the effect of ABE programs in counties which slowly complied with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not fully recognized. In areas only recently desegregated, a program with so many implications for blacks had to affect attitudes, aspirations, and reluctance of staff who dealt directly with ABE learners.
3. The position of administrators in the state departments of education was not understood, as it affected their ability to act and the necessity for much preliminary planning and negotiation. Travel was sometimes restricted, making attendance at meetings difficult at times. The inability to speak for a department on a decision or to give assurance of a definite time schedule was initially frustrating. These limitations made state departments generally conservative by nature and caused much misunderstanding by other project participants.

4. Reluctance by higher educational institutions to participate was seen by others as having only one reason: that a "soft money" program would be established with a limited assurance of enough legitimacy and institutional support to continue after external funding ceased. Actually, there may have been at least two other reasons for seeming reluctance by faculty. Less visible to others was the sense of urgency felt by new faculty members to establish stable positions at their institutions; many general adult education faculty got their start through money from an ABE source. They were concerned with sinking roots, establishing competence, and demonstrating worth, in order to show long-term advantage to their institutions. A third reason was their increasingly evident professional desire to move from a primary emphasis on ABE to one dealing with general adult education and appealing to a wider-than-teacher clientele.

5. SREB's caution was not seen fully by project participants. While the political basis of the regional organization was recognized, the extent of potential restraint never was apparent. In particular, those not familiar with the history of SREB since its establishment in 1948 did not know of the strong ties to state political leadership throughout the South. As a creation of the Southern Governors' Conference and a recipient of annual appropriations from state legislatures, SREB maintained a conservative posture, opting for persistent higher education growth, based on study and research of the needs. Progress was essential but it was necessary for it to be in harmony with the political and economic realities, be they state or institutional.

6. The hesitancy of traditionally black institutions was understood with some difficulty. The project's beginning coincided with desegregation and massive dislocation of black teachers and, to a greater extent, administrators. In addition, the real purpose for maintaining a separate black educational system was being questioned. New programs, then, were greeted with definite skepticism.
7. Funding pressures on the Office of Education were not fully recognized. These pressures had a Congressional base, deriving from ties between legislators and local officials. The Office of Education also was receiving pressure from the newly-formed National Council of State Directors, interested in maximum allocation of discretionary funds for ABE staff development.

Existing mistrust. It seems obvious that trust would not be evident. A few themes pointed toward the limited amount of trust existing at the beginning of the project:

1. uncertainty in some groups about the willingness of others to meet them on their own terms and in their own territory
2. skepticism about the ability of participants to isolate staff development needs
3. pessimism concerning the amount of financial assistance available in addition to federal funding
4. doubt about the moral and political support available to help with the development of programs
5. doubt about the lasting nature of programs and relationships whose beginnings lay in federal support

The existence of these doubts and others points out the importance of eliminating rather than simply overcoming the obstacles to a cooperative working relationship.

PROJECT STRATEGIES AND PROCESSES

When examining the stated objectives of this project, as it was originally conceived, it is relatively simple to document the short-range goals (one year) and to identify the general goals (several years). Not easily identified, however, are interim goals and processes that were developed along the way. These were an outgrowth of needs perceived by participants of the project or the result of new practices showing success in the states. Frequently, these were single-thrust activities developed to achieve one objective at a particular point in time. The processes through which such activity takes place are not easily identified or described.

Before the Region IV Project, the ABE efforts in the several states were disjointed, unplanned, and regionally uncoordinated. Thus, specific processes had to be developed by the regional staff to achieve objectives at particular points in time for particular purposes. All of these short-term objectives had to be fitted into the larger, more general project goals.

In more than a few instances, short-term objectives were accomplished through face-to-face discussion by project staff with the state ABE person who could best coordinate and direct the activities. This kind of process is not easily documented as it is a stand-alone, one-time contact. However, such contacts cannot be disregarded. Many of the processes described here are not single actions on the part of individuals involved. The use of combinations of processes was often more effective.

It should be clearly understood that the evolving processes were considered and deliberate. They were not simple by-products of actions taken by project staff or participants. Project staff spent considerable

time identifying those processes that had shown good results elsewhere. Analysis of successful procedures occurred before any steps were taken to apply them. Essentially, project staff created a road map with certain guideposts (processes) along the way toward predetermined goals.

PHASE 1: 1969-1972

At the onset of the staff development project (1969), the three-year goal was to create three major regionwide teacher training resources: in state departments, in universities, and in local programs. The intention was that each state would be able to plan and provide inservice training to ABE staff whenever needed. Universities and colleges would provide preservice and inservice undergraduate and graduate training throughout each state. Selected ABE teachers and coordinators would be trained to conduct local inservice activities. Within the state departments of education, leadership would be provided to coordinate these resources and inservice training.

The focus of the project was better and more training for teachers and other professional staff. Six major objectives were identified. Four were to be planned and carried out by the state ABE director in each state; two regional objectives were the concern of project staff. The six objectives were:

1. to develop higher education capabilities by involving at least two institutions in each state in pre- and inservice adult and adult basic education through courses and graduate degree programs,
2. to provide continuing consultant service from college and university instructors (a) to local ABE programs in order to assist these programs and to give university instructors experience which would influence their curricula toward more meaningful training experiences; and (b) to state departments of education.

3. to develop inservice capability and training competencies in local programs, and to assist supervisors in establishing sequential seminar and workshop programs,
4. to strengthen state department of education inservice leadership, by enhancing the role its personnel play in the planning and utilization of staff development resources available in each state and throughout the region,
5. to conduct a regional seminar program to provide an opportunity for state departments of education, university faculty, and local program staffs to meet and discuss issues related to teacher training and professional development,
6. to conduct a technical services program to bring to the region technical expertise and specialized materials not available to individual institutions or states.

The objectives of the Region IV Staff Development Project as stated above were formulated in concert with state directors of ABE programs. These objectives were achieved over a three-year period through development of implementation processes within each state and regionally. The burden for developing these processes rested initially with the Region IV project staff of SREB. At that point, the project staff was the only entity that had the expertise and resources to bring together the six states involved. (The six states were later expanded to eight when federal regions were redefined.)

Phase 1, the first three years of project activities, was marked by successful accomplishments brought about by the accumulative processes described later in this section. The major work of the project centered on building state and regionwide staff development systems. The systems

were largely institutionalized in each state with respect to each of the six major objectives of the projects.

PHASE II: 1972-1974

Phase II of the project (1972-74) utilized the staff development systems previously established as vehicles for disseminating innovative ideas and materials to ABE teachers at the local level. The accomplishments of the first three-year project provided the foundation for this subsequent focus on dissemination.

The new direction in project staff activity encompassed two major goals. These were:

1. to begin identifying appropriate dissemination roles for each training resource within a state; and
2. to try out ways of using for dissemination the existing pre- and inservice training network.

These two objectives were broadened to include the development of a system for disseminating materials within each state.

A redirection of attention and effort was necessary in order to achieve the new objectives of dissemination of materials and information. The processes that had been developed during the first three years of the project were retained and expanded at times to encompass the new project focus. Dissemination would be accomplished by carrying out the following tasks:

1. Determine needs and establish priorities
2. Locate promising products
3. Set criteria for selection or specifications for development
4. Select, adopt, or adapt the product
5. Identify and alert the intended users

6. Plan strategies and techniques
7. Obtain the product
8. Distribute the product and/or provide training
9. Assess and refine the dissemination system

In Phase I and Phase II, a variety of mechanisms (processes) were carried out to accomplish the objectives of the project. These processes are related below to six major outcomes realized by the project during its five years.

Outcome 1. Stronger leadership in state departments of education

a. Membership on the Project Planning Committee was restricted to state directors to put them in a broad decision-making role.

b. Regular meetings of the Planning Committee were scheduled to assist state directors with allocations of project and state funds to staff development/dissemination activities. The Committee suggested areas where funds would yield the greatest growth in training and staff development.

c. All project business was processed through the state director. Guidelines for expenditures were discussed with state directors, who in turn approved the expenditures of project funds in their states. State directors and project staff cooperatively planned each state's budget.

d. Project staff urged the state director to fiscally support inservice participants' rewards, trainer salaries, partial university expenses (including 1/3 salary and travel) in order to build a base from which he could request staff development services.

e. One person in each state department was designated as the staff development specialist. This person had a key role in training and disseminating activities. Project staff conducted regional training sessions for staff development specialists. The project paid full or part salary of this person after commitment from the state director for continued support. Staff development specialists helped to plan regional project activities and became chairmen of state project planning committees when such a committee was organized. All programmatic business was routed directly to the staff development specialist.

f. The project created a staff development/dissemination role for area supervisors or state consultants by setting them up as the major public relations person for spreading information to teachers and coordinators about university courses and consulting services. At opportune times project staff emphasized the advantages of redefining and expanding supervisors' responsibilities in terms of their being liaisons between the state departments (and state planning committees) and local programs. They were encouraged to take the lead in setting up planning committees for their geographical area, along with a university professor, usually the one serving that area (if in one of the five states where the area service concept had been adopted).

g. Under the proposal, state ABE directors identified key ABE persons in each state who could assist in furthering the objectives of the project. It was recognized that involvement of local ABE persons throughout each state was essential

to the success of the project. The strategy here was to involve key ABE people and, through meetings and other training devices, convince them of the worth and need for expanded training opportunities for all ABE teachers in the state. Thus, the vehicle for getting ABE training to the grassroots was not project staff nor the state department staff but the local person.

h. Often state department personnel met with those key people to discuss training needs at the local level.

i. Historically, there had been little interaction among Region IV states in the area of ABE. To overcome this isolation of activity, regional workshops were supported by project funds. Interest in staff development in the region was fostered through discussion between project staff, project consultants, and representatives of the several states. As a result of these conversations, competition for progress toward project objectives was generated in the states.

j. Project staff standardized and routinized the collection of ABE information and materials from each of the states. Dissemination of data and products to the region was a planned process through which ABE activity in each state was increased.

Outcome 2. Colleges and universities capable of providing services for staff development in adult education

a. To encourage institutions of higher education in the region to develop ABE courses on and off campus, the project entered into agreements with selected colleges and universities whereby the institutions would receive project support for faculty salary and expenses related to staff development activities.

b. The project also supported travel by professors of adult education to establish off-campus courses, to attend ABE meetings in the state and region, and to offer assistance to local programs. A professor's visibility in the field was to have two major results: (1) the recruitment of students to their courses and thus increased tuition to the university, and (2) the redirection of credit courses to reflect teacher concerns.

c. Traditionally, ABE faculty in institutions of higher education have not occupied predominant status within the instructional cadre. Project funds were provided to new ABE faculty for graduate assistants, travel, secretarial aid, and other expenses. Project funds were also provided for professors to attend professional meetings and generally improve their competence in their area of expertise.

d. The project encouraged increased state/university support for staff development by graduating expenditures of project funds for the first three years, in the ratios of 2:1, 1:1, 1:2.

e. The project spread the concept of each university serving a defined geographical area, encouraged its adoption, and supported its implementation. Funds were provided for professor's travel to programs within his service area. Cooperation was encouraged between the professor and state supervisor assigned to a geographic area in planning inservice activities (preferably through an area planning committee), in conducting inservice training, and in disseminating information.

f. An emerging strategy in each state was to establish a state planning committee for staff development. In most cases a cross-section of ABE personnel in each state served on this committee. In all states the university professors were a regular part of this committee. Others who composed the group were the staff development specialists, area supervisors, local personnel and, in some instances, graduate students. Through interaction among these groups diverse strategies were proposed and considered prior to implementation.

g. University professors were always major participants in professional training seminars held within the states and regionally.

h. Information resulting from the state and regional seminars was systematically distributed to all professors, as well as other ABE personnel in the region, by project or state staff. In this way professors who were unable to attend special sessions were aware of the general import of discussions and could operate from the same information base as others.

Outcome 3. A cadre of trained teachers and coordinators available for conducting inservice training

a. The project supported plans and activities leading toward a permanent cadre of teachers and coordinators who could serve as trainers.

b. Project funds have contributed to the success of summer institutes to train teachers as specialists. These institutes

were organized and taught by ABE professors at the various institutions of higher education. The institutions had received project funds to support this activity. The crucial part of the plan here was to build a relationship between local ABE teachers and university ABE staff that would exist over time. Funds were also provided by the project that would enable local teachers to attend the classes and workshops. Project staff saw part of the "pay-off" as being the development of a willingness by teachers to request that classes be offered in their local areas and to ingrain in them the idea that expert assistance was available on request.

c. The project also provided travel funds and stipends for trainers when their services were requested by local directors or state department staff.

d. Local personnel were made a part of all regional meetings at the invitation of state directors.

e. Specially trained teachers and coordinators were involved in identifying needs and in planning ways to meet those needs.

f. Regularly published statistical reports were sent to state departments and from there to key local ABE personnel showing the growth of ABE training in each state.

Outcome 4. Planning committees for staff development and dissemination in each state

a. Project staff set up and directed a series of regional seminars to draw together representatives from the Region IV states for the purpose of identifying and discussing ABE problems common to the region. At subsequent seminars state

directors were urged to invite the same core of persons who had previously been involved. Those persons who were currently active in ABE work and who were, at that point in time, recognized as leaders in the state were selected. Also persons who had been identified by state directors as potential contributors were extended invitations. Eventually these people formed the nuclei for state planning committees.

b. The inclusion of local ABE coordinators and teachers was seen as a part of the planned process for disseminating ABE materials and ideas down to the local level. The inclusion of active local people resulted in strong local support.

c. Expenses of planning committee meetings were made a priority expenditure of project funds, and one or both project staff attended these meetings. Funds were also allocated for outside consultants as needed.

d. The project requested that participants in regional activities be selected from the state committee to build consistency in state planning.

e. In those states which had adopted the service area concept, the project encouraged the development of area planning committees and urged that membership of these smaller groups include teachers, local coordinators, the assigned area supervisor, and the university professor for that area.

f. State departments of education ABE staffs met with university and college personnel. ABE faculty had been meeting with local coordinators and providing inservice courses for local teachers. A concerted effort was made by these groups to

shift some of the responsibility for staff development directly to the local level, i.e., include teachers and coordinators in the planning and implementation of local training.

g. After meetings of the state planning committees had been held, and plans for training had been formulated, the various members of the committee reviewed the proposed plan(s) with their local constituents.

Outcome 5. A written plan for staff development and dissemination in each state

a. The project, by collating and publishing state plans, insured that each state prepare a written statement of staff development/dissemination plans and that ABE personnel were aware of such plans.

b. Participants at the third regional seminar were to prepare a rough oral presentation of staff development plans for the coming year. These plans became more permanent when expanded during the summer and revised at the fourth regional seminar.

c. With the change of emphasis from building staff development resources to dissemination, the project established a process which fostered the addition of dissemination to the staff development plans as a logical means of keeping training resources up to date. This lead to charting the description of intended dissemination systems, and defining the roles of resource people.

d. Funds for expenses involved in planning sessions, preparation, and production of plans were given priority expenditure status in each state during the fourth and fifth project year.

e. The project urged that the state planning committees be involved in preparing state plans and in approving them.

f. The project produced enough copies of each plan for every ABE person in that state. These copies were distributed through the staff development specialists and the networks that had been established. Also, two compilations of all eight plans were published for national distribution: one at the end of the first three years, the other following two subsequent years of work on dissemination.

Outcome 6. The provision of technical expertise, consultant aid, and professional development to the region

a. Often state planning necessitated consideration of ABE activities in other states as part of the planning effort. The strategy was to provide technical and consultant help not readily available in the state. At the onset of the project, these services were largely brought in from outside the region. As the project evolved and statewide and regional meetings were held, much of this expertise was identified or developed within the region.

b. The project conducted seven regional seminars for state staff, professors, and teachers and coordinators. Structured meetings forced peers to work together on a common task and opened communications where perhaps none had existed. Grouping participants by state promoted interpersonal relationships and

communication. Also, outside consultants who assisted with six seminars exposed the regional ABE personnel to other viewpoints.

c. The project conducted regional workshops on planning of short-duration training, evaluation of ABE programs, and strategies for dissemination and an institute for teachers of blind ABE learners.

d. All staff development specialists were brought together twice to work on specific problem areas, e.g. components of a dissemination system.

e. All graduate assistants met once for orientation to the project and for training in interview techniques as part of a year-end project evaluation.

f. Institutions of higher education were encouraged to offer specialized courses in the teaching of specific subject-matter content. These courses were to be offered at college locations, in local classes, and in summer institutes.

g. The project supported expenses for individuals to consult with programs in other states when their services had been requested.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

According to the project participants themselves, the benefits and outcomes of the regional staff development project were many. The most prominent are described here, followed by a general assessment and speculation on what will remain upon the anticipated termination of federal funds for a regional project.

The initial goal of the project, as conceived in 1968 and 1969, was to increase the capability of state departments of education, institutions of higher education, and local adult education programs to conduct staff development. Later in 1972 an emphasis on dissemination was added.

The extent to which the project benefited states, institutions, and local programs and the extent to which the goals were reached has been commented on in detail by the participants. During the fourth quarter of the project's final year (April-June, 1974) the evaluation panel asked state directors, selected university faculty, and selected local program staff to respond on tape to several questions (Appendix A). The questions covered the range of project operation from regional activities to state department and university services. Also, during the six-month's extension period the project staff personally interviewed all state directors and faculty to gather information (Appendix B) on their views of the continuation of project activities beyond December 31, 1974.

The following assessment is based on data accumulated by the project over the years and on the compiled responses of the project participants to evaluation questions. Descriptions of accomplishments are followed by project activities continuing into 1975 and beyond. All of this has been categorized according to the six main project objectives discussed earlier.

To develop higher education capabilities by involving at least two institutions in each state in pre- and inservice adult and adult basic education through courses and graduate degree programs

ACHIEVEMENTS	1969	1974
Growth in the number of institutions involved with state department in project activities	16	27
A six-fold increase in the number of adult education courses taught on campus	48 courses/ 525 students	309 courses/ 2995 students
A tripling of the number of adult education courses taught off campus	41 courses/ 1148 students	127 courses/ 2995 students
Increase in the number of adult education programs established at universities in the region	4	31
Institutionalized programs through deliberate shift in fiscal responsibility	Total project support for faculty, secretary, graduate assistants	Project support for graduate assistants, state and/or university support for all else

At all 27 institutions, on-campus courses have been initiated and will likely continue. All university programs offering graduate credit courses are institutionalized. (Exception: In one state one institution has dropped its adult education program. Another institution, however, has joined the staff development network.) Nearly all faculty and a majority of the state directors felt that their university curricula were more or less teacher (practical) oriented, with most off-campus courses being of this kind. Two faculty reported that their curricula were not teacher oriented for various reasons. Several indicated they had multi-tracked curricula, the chief of which was teacher oriented. In contrast, only two state directors indicated their states had fully teacher-oriented courses and programs at participating universities. In four states, adult education programs were judged to be

academic by state directors, and in two other states, individual professors were cited as being too academic in orientation.

As for off-campus courses, only one faculty reported that his program was restricted to the campus due to state policies. Consultant services activities, however, were provided to ABE programs by this professor. In all other cases at least some off-campus courses are offered, but this has varied as a result of demand by potential students and the availability of travel money for this purpose.

There is no doubt that the adult education programs established at the 27 universities will continue, though one or two may need strengthening. Nearly everyone contacted at the end of the year expressed concern for the support base that would be available to these programs. Faculty especially recognized the influence which the regional project had had on urging universities to establish adult education programs. They were almost unanimous in their praise for project staff in influencing administrators to establish and maintain such programs and in offering guidance for program content.

To provide continuing consultant services from college and university faculty to local ABE programs and to state departments of education

ACHIEVEMENT	1969	1974
Increase in the number of university professors available to local programs and state departments of education	7	36
Increase in number of graduate assistants available to local programs	0	34
Increase in number of on-site visits made by faculty to local programs	32	550
Rapport established between faculty and local program personnel	None	Informal communications; locals in direct contact with faculty
Communications established between state department staff and faculty	Infrequent, guarded	Frequent, more informal and congenial

Always an important part of the regional project, faculty services to local programs and to state departments increased each year at a rapid rate. During the last two years, however, individual professors felt that their visits to teachers and coordinators in the field had been limited because of the change in project emphasis. Rarely did university or state departments pick up the expenses for travel to local programs. Much of the time the professors themselves personally assumed this kind of expense in the interest of serving teachers and coordinators. Upon termination of the project, an immediate concern of local program staff was the possibility of losing direct faculty assistance to individuals and at inservice meetings. Faculty, too, foresaw less personal contact with those in the field and regretted the loss of project assistance in preparing materials for their work with local programs.

Faculty assistance to state department inservice efforts has varied over the years but is provided in all but one state. In three states faculty at all participating universities are active in inservice and will likely continue to be. In contrast, faculty from three other states participate only at the special invitation of the state director.

The information collected by the evaluation panel at the end of the fifth project year showed disagreement between state directors and faculty as to the amount of consultant and non-credit services actually offered by faculty. The only two state directors accurately aware of the continuing consultant work being done by faculty in the field were those who provided travel funds for this purpose. The other six state directors had assumed that such services had slowed down or stopped altogether when project funds for this were decreased. According to the faculty, however, this had not been the case. They do indeed provide non-credit instruction at workshops and help teachers individually with problems, and do it with much more frequency than state directors are aware of.

To provide inservice capability and training competencies in local programs, and to assist in establishing sequential seminar and workshop programs

ACHIEVEMENT	1969	1974
A cadre of special trainers (teachers and coordinators) available for conducting local workshops	0	565
Statewide systems for training these special trainers through summer institutes	0	3
The practice of involving teachers and coordinators on planning committees and on task forces to develop new materials	Widespread in Florida; rare elsewhere	Common in all states
A minimum of two inservice experiences available annually to teachers	Not available	Available; many conducted by special trainers

Local staff trained as trainers are supported and used differentially throughout the region. Three states train local staff to be trainers, use them in inservice programs, and pay a small fee for their services. Five states do not have a special training program. Instead, they use local staff who have been involved in the development of a product or have gained recognition for having a specialty. In these cases, no salary is paid, but an occasional consultant fee may be provided. In the three states which regularly involve trainers in inservice, the state department coordinates their activities.

At the end of the project, there was considerable agreement among state directors that they will continue to involve local program staff on planning committees. Directors felt that their input and influence had been valuable.

A good relationship with individual local staff programs characterized the involvement of project staff. However, the majority of state directors reporting felt that the project's involvement at the local level had been limited. This might be expected if one considers the number on the project staff and the relatively large number of local ABE programs now operating throughout the region. The most direct and consistent contact of project staff with local programs has been through the state planning committees. These meetings have been quite beneficial in terms of staff assistance in planning for, and dissemination of projects adopted by the committees.

To strengthen state department of education leadership in staff development, by enhancing the role its personnel play in planning and utilizing staff development resources

ACHIEVEMENT	1969	1974
A person in the state department assigned to staff development	0	7
A state planning committee chaired by the staff development specialist	0	8
Area planning committees coordinated by staff development specialist or other state department staff	0	3 states
State staff development/dissemination plans prepared and published through efforts of planning committees and staff development specialists	0	8
Statewide planning meetings coordinated by state department	0	80
Increase in number of area workshops coordinated by state department staff	92	134
Coordination of at least two inservice experiences annually for each teacher	Goal	Reality
Salary support for university faculty	0	3 states
Support for university programs through contracts, summer institutes, research services, etc.	0	6

Of the thirteen aspects of state department leadership mentioned in interviews with state directors and university faculty, eight are currently operational and will continue after termination of the project. These included: (1) the role of the state director in providing leadership for staff development/dissemination efforts, (2) the permanent assignment of staff development/dissemination responsibilities to a state department staff member, (3) operation of an active, statewide, representative advisory committee, (4) joint exercise of staff development/dissemination functions

by state departments of education, university and local program personnel, (5) role of area supervisors in staff development/dissemination, (6) a state plan for staff development currently in operation, (7) the provision of at least two inservice experiences for local ABE program staff, and (8) the provision of fiscal support to inservice participants by the state.

Variation exists in the extent to which these activities have been institutionalized in each state. For example, staff development dissemination responsibilities are primary assignments for state staff in only two states. In the others this responsibility is assigned to someone who, in addition, has several other duties; and in one state this responsibility is retained by the state director.

The roles which area supervisors play in staff development/dissemination activities also vary across the region. In five states they have become key to these activities in the service areas assigned to them. Generally, in these five states, staff development activities are planned and operated by the area supervisor and coordinated statewide by the staff development specialist. This is not the case in the other states for two reasons: (1) state staff do not have area assignments, and (2) supervisors are assigned in rotation to various responsibilities.

All states provide at least two inservice experiences each year, and three exceed this. Only in one state are all inservice experiences organized and provided by the state. The typical pattern in the region is for the state to provide one experience for all the program staff in an area, and for local programs to provide the second. Area supervisors are usually involved in both.

In these inservice programs, six states provide local programs with teacher salary and travel funds for inservice. The budget and contract

typically extend the number of teaching hours beyond that required in classroom instruction. One state does not authorize salary for time spent in inservice, and one state allows the teacher to make other arrangements for the class while attending inservice training activities.

The five aspects of state department leadership which participants did not feel were established include: (1) the existence and operation of area staff development/dissemination committees, (2) the provision of salary for university faculty by the state department, (3) the provision of auxiliary support by the state department for university programs, (4) the provision of fiscal support by the state to local staff trained as trainers, and (5) the existence of a system in the state for using local trainers. It should be noted, however, that all of these activities were operating in at least some of the states but, by and large, they have not been uniformly institutionalized throughout the region. The status of the operation of these activities is presented in the following paragraphs.

In two states area staff development/dissemination committees have been established and are working satisfactorily. One state is just now organizing area committees, and two others report that individual area committees need to be stimulated to greater activity. Three states operate staff development/dissemination activities on a statewide basis and do not have area committees.

Faculty salaries are provided to institutions of higher education by state departments in three states. Initially, project funds were provided to pay salaries in full or in part at almost every institution but this was phased out as planned after the initial three-year period. After this, five states continued to provide salary from existing resources, two of which have since terminated this support. Three states never provided salaries for faculty after this initial period.

A number of state departments provide auxiliary support for university programs other than for salaries. Three states provide funds for such program expenses as travel, materials, secretary, and other line items. Three states provide service and summer institute contracts to universities under terms which allow minor supplementary support. Two states do not contribute any of their state funds to provide support except for reimbursement of expenses. Additionally, funds are provided in two states for support of graduate students.

To conduct a regional seminar program for discussion of teacher training and staff development issues

ACHIEVEMENT	1969-1974
Opportunities for all project participants--state department staff, university faculty, and local program staff--meeting together to examine issues and concerns and to solve problems	Seven regional seminars of two to four days' duration over a five-year period; held around the region for well over 100 participants each

At the end of the fifth year all project participants expressed positive feelings about the regional seminars. They agreed that emphasis on staff development and dissemination provided focal points for discussion, and that SREB's sponsoring the seminars gave legitimacy and status to the meetings. This was important for those who needed authorization for leave and for out-of-state travel. All participants felt that these professional meetings broadened their perspectives, introduced new approaches to them, and allowed all to grow professionally.

Staff development specialists mentioned that they would miss the access to their colleagues provided to them through the regional seminars. Teachers

and coordinators were emphatic about the value they saw in being able to exchange ideas with colleagues from other states. Without the regional seminar program such opportunities would be rare. Both the faculty members and the state directors feared a return to parochialism unless some way could be found to continue meeting on a regional basis. The opportunities for cooperative work and the achievements of the seminars were seen as important to growth in staff development.

Most participants forecast the virtual end of regional activities upon completion of the project. University faculty saw little likelihood of their continuing, but state directors expressed more optimism. The most persistent problems would be the existence of a coordinating group with the authority and means to organize such efforts, and the availability of funds for interstate travel. The one possibility for continuing these regional seminars seemed to rest with the state directors, who were seen as having the means for meeting together as a coordinating body and the power to allocate some funds for regional conferences.

To conduct a technical services program which would bring to the region (1) technical expertise, and (2) specialized materials and training not available to individual institutions or states

ACHIEVEMENTS	1969-1974
Opportunities for selected participants to receive special information and/or training	Two institutes for teachers of the blind, 1969, 1970 Seminar on evaluation, 1970 Institute on planning and evaluation, 1970 Meeting on development of graduate programs, 1971 Meetings of state department staff to discuss state plans and dissemination activities, 1971, 1972 Graduate student meeting on techniques of interviewing, 1973 Workshop on dissemination strategies, 1974
The existence of a regional system for disseminating information	Project participants received the latest information on new materials and techniques
New products and publications fostered with project funds or project and state funds	14 Summer Institute Reports 4 Course Outlines 3 Publications on Teaching Reading 1 Recruitment Kit 2 Publications on Recruitment 2 Textbooks on Disadvantaged Adults 2 APL Training Series 2 Periodic State Newsletters 1 Training Kit for Individualizing Instruction

Technical expertise. During the life of the regional project, special assistance was provided either by project staff or by consultants drawn from national and regional pools. They assisted the state departments of education,

faculty, and local staff in their planning and decision-making and in developing programs and products. To quote one state director: "States in Region IV have many educational needs which could be provided through consultants in a regional project; however without the project it will not be possible for states to provide the technical expertise on a state by state basis." This statement reflects a concensus of opinion with regard to loss of project assistance.

The Consultants brought in by project staff to assist in the ABE program at the state level have proved valuable. Such assistance will still be available to the separate states on a diminished scale but that phase of the program concerned with regional planning that came into existence during the project will probably be lost. Persons within the region having a particular expertise have only recently begun to cross over into other states to conduct workshops. Much concern was evidenced that this activity will also decrease without the project to coordinate and at times give financial support.

Staff development specialists thought that much of the consulting services required at the local level could be provided through university personnel and other specialists in the state. One potential problem area was identified however by staff development specialists. During the past several years, the regional project has supplied much support to consultants who conducted summer institutes. This support was not seen as being assumed by each of the several states. Thus there may be a sharp decline in the number of summer training institutes and workshops which will be offered in the future. State directors and faculty felt more optimistic about the use of out-of-state talent across state lines for consulting and inservice work. They felt it would continue, especially for summer institutes. Several

cited that use of talent across state lines was one of the great services initiated by the project because exposure was provided for the many talented people within the region. A fear was expressed, however, that without continuing regional effort, interstate use of talent would revert to the typical "consultant" arrangement for only a few persons who have gained special recognition on a national or regional level.

Faculty members also viewed the general consultant and technical expertise program provided through the project as valuable. The most useful outcome of the program at the university level has been to "cause adult educators to make a minimum of errors (based on outside assessment of the problem)." Another positive result of the program has been to provide field experience to graduate students who are working toward advanced degrees in ABE/AE.

Most of the assistance provided to faculty was in the area of preparing course outlines for instructors of adult education in the respective states and in suggesting ideas for course content. The relationship between faculty and project staff was "quite beneficial" as seen by faculty, and generally projects or courses suggested by project staff appear to have been well accepted by faculty and in turn received rather wide distribution within the several states.

Consultant assistance has been provided to local programs that otherwise would have been impossible to obtain without the project's assistance and coordination. In some instances out-of-state consultants were brought to local workshops and were well received. Many teachers and coordinators said that they had requested help in local program matters directly from project staff and "in every instance assistance was provided by project staff." Project staff also assisted in planning summer institutes and

workshops. Those services would be difficult to replace. Local and state funds to support technical assistance and consultants are apparently not available in most instances. State directors recognize that they will be faced with the problem of filling a consultant/advisor/resource person void from within their own department or through university resources.

Specialized materials. Although awareness information on new materials had always been provided, the amount of information reaching participants through the regional project office increased considerably when the project focus became dissemination. Hundreds of informative items--brochures, books, reports, statistical listings, bibliographies, and so on--were distributed by the project. Such items were gathered from within and outside of the region.

The state directors and staff development specialists reported they periodically receive information from other existing sources, such as other state directors and clearinghouses, but that this is not on a regular, systematic basis. They reported that the efforts of project staff have provided a sorely needed service in keeping their states informed of developments in other areas of the country. A few participants felt that the project should have been more selective in some of the materials that were disseminated. However, it was also noted that the project had produced and distributed much useful materials that heretofore had been unattainable.

The majority of state directors relate that they have some funds in their respective offices for publication and distribution of materials. However, much concern is evidenced that they may not be able to provide the quantity of materials that local programs have been requesting in recent months--when the regional project terminates. Other concerns are that materials formerly produced by project staff for regional distribution

will no longer be available and that the project has been procuring and distributing adult education materials to the several states on a systematic basis. The following statement from a state director reflects the attitude of many: "Support (by the project) was tremendous and very beneficial to our total program. It gave us access to concepts and ideas being tried throughout the nation. . .many were tried here and implemented."

Project efforts have been quite successful in bringing innovative methods of instruction to the attention of state directors of ABE. These instructional devices, techniques, and materials have been widely distributed to local programs throughout the region as is amply evidenced by comments of staff development specialists. Many staff development specialists feel that project termination will result in a loss of opportunity to distribute, statewide and regionally, some of the products that have been developed during the life of the project, particularly in the past year. Of note is the feeling of several staff development specialists that to continue the production and distribution of publications and materials will mean withdrawing funds from other activities to support this function. They see this activity as critical to local programs and apparently will sacrifice resources now allotted to other areas in order to continue, if even on a limited scale.

The impact of project termination on producing and distributing materials for instruction can best be seen from comments of local ABE personnel. The following statements are typical: "Without the project, I believe publications will cease, and along with the ceasing will come a decrease in success and effectiveness of the program." "Availability of funds alone will not cause publications to be produced. It takes the enthusiasm of project staff to help formulate materials." "Getting good research and effective instructional material down to the level where they are really needed has been one of the significant successes of the SREB project."

SUMMARY

Overall, the Region IV Staff Development/Dissemination Project has had and will continue to have an impact on the functioning of state departments of education and university systems in the region. The project has supplied services, consultant expertise, funds, and has served as a coordinating agent for the ABE effort of the region. It has brought unity of purpose and harmony of action to a previously disjointed and fragmented regional activity. Prior to the regional project, a vehicle for planning and interchange of ideas at the state and regional levels had been nonexistent. A regional planning committee oversees staff development activities and advises the state director on future direction. One significant statement seems to reflect the attitude of most of the project participants: "The project has shown our state what needs to be done in order to have good communication linkages." It is evident that the existence of the project and the presence of project staff have had a deep, meaningful impact on adult educators at all levels.

The impact of the project has had a different effect on the various resources involved. Many of the activities undertaken through this project will continue to exist; others will terminate or be greatly modified. In general those activities that were conducted primarily by project staff across the region will cease upon termination of the project. There is a possibility that some of these regional activities will be continued by the regional planning committee of state directors, provided that funds can be found. Those activities that were initiated through existing institutions, such as state departments and universities, and that resulted in changed operations of on-going state, area, local, and university programs will continue, with a few exceptions.

Information obtained for this report indicates that the staff development/dissemination function is firmly institutionalized in all state departments of education. There is no doubt that this function will continue within each state; however, some of the activities may be modified according to available funding and human resources. Those in the most precarious position regarding continuation are: the operation of area staff development/dissemination committees, the provision of state support for faculty and university programs, and the utilization of local staff as trainers.

University programs have become institutionalized throughout the region and, in general, provide teacher-oriented curricula in both on- and off-campus locations. There is some disagreement and misunderstanding on the extent and nature to which consultant and non-credit inservice work is provided by faculty. However, in many states, and in a number of institutions, close working relations have been established between faculty and state departments that have, in part, been cemented by funding, contractual, and other support arrangements.

Systems for training and utilizing local staff as trainers have been institutionalized in only a small number of states. One can conclude that this aspect of the project is precarious on a regional basis, but will likely continue in approximately one-half of the states. Likewise the establishment of an unbroken communications link between teachers and state-level decision makers, primarily state directors, has been institutionalized in only two of the states. This significant aspect of the regional project has only recently taken root and needs considerable nurturance and direction in the future. With the completion of the regional project, responsibility for building better and more open communication channels lies with the state director.

The prod provided by the project for participants to try the new, as well as the traditional, was a useful contribution that will be missed; it could lead many states and individuals to return to old and somewhat parochial ways. The flexible approach taken by project administrators was cited as a impetus to many important advances in staff development and information dissemination; that flexibility was not normally available in the constraints of departments of education or colleges and universities and will limit future activities.

Also, there was a feeling that SREB through its established reputation in the Southeast could suggest steps and stand above rivalry among states and between higher educational institutions. It gave status to a program in ABE staff development and information dissemination, a program which drew attention from educational and political leaders throughout the country.

Overall, the project has effectively established a permanent network of staff development/dissemination resources in the eight states. State directors exercise a leadership role utilizing a staff development/dissemination supervisor, a statewide planning committee, departmental area supervisors, university faculty, and local planners and trainers. The objectives of graduate credit courses within driving distance and at least two inservice training sessions for all ABE staff were reached. These staff development activities will remain and continue to grow beyond the life of the regional project.

APPENDIX A: LAST QUARTER EVALUATION TOPICS

Information on the following topics was gathered at the end of the fourth quarter of the last full year of the project. Project participants selected to respond were among the state staffs, university faculty, and local program staffs. Taped responses were summarized by a trained assistant and forwarded to members of the project's evaluation panel for review and analysis.

The main question was: What will be the effect on your program when the regional project terminates, related to the following areas?

Topic areas were:

A. the effect of SREB as a grantee agency

B. the availability of funds for the program

C. the opportunity for collective discussion in-state and across state lines

D. the role and relationships of project staff with the state director, the university faculty, the local staff

E. support for producing and distributing publications and materials

F. general consultant assistance and technical expertise

G. your awareness of projects and publications outside of the region

H. support for university programs

Respondents could, if they chose, respond to a final open-ended question:

Do you have any other comments relating to the above points or to the project?

APPENDIX B: FINAL EVALUATION TOPICS AND RESPONSES

Information on the following items was gathered at the end of the fifth year from state directors and participating university faculty in each state. Exact wording of the questions varied for each group since they viewed activities and successes from different vantage points.

Regional activities

1. State directors will continue as an interstate coordinating committee
2. Annual regional seminars or conferences will continue to be held
3. Regional workshops for instruction in topics of common need will continue
4. Awareness of new products and distribution of innovations will continue
5. Interstate exchange of human resources/talent will continue

State department staff and activities

1. The state director in the leadership role
2. A staff member whose major responsibility is staff development/dissemination
3. A statewide representative advisory or planning committee
4. An area SDE/University/local activity role
5. An area SDE supervisor role in staff development
6. Area advisory or planning committees
7. 1/3 to 1/2 faculty position fiscal support
8. A state plan for staff development/dissemination (published)
9. Auxiliary support for university program (travel, materials, secretary, graduate student, etc.)
10. At least two inservice opportunities annually for each teacher
11. Fiscal support to local trainers (teacher training, travel, fee, etc.)
12. System for using local trainers
13. Support for professional inservice development of staff (travel, salary, etc.)

University services

1. A teacher-oriented graduate level curriculum
2. On-campus courses
3. Off-campus courses throughout the service area
4. Consultant services to local programs
5. Non-credit instructional services to SDE inservice/activities
6. Non-credit instructional services to local programs/community

Local program activities

1. Trained trainers
2. Planning committee input
3. Communications link from teacher to decision maker

Table 1. Responses to Interview Questions

	State Directors			University Faculty		
	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable
REGIONAL ACTIVITIES						
State directors will continue as an interstate coordinating committee	6	2	--	10	14	--
Annual regional seminars or conferences will continue to be held	3	5	--	2	22	--
Regional workshops for instruction in topics of common need will continue	1	7	--	2	22	--
Awareness of new products and distribution of innovations will continue	3	5	--	7	17	--
Interstate exchange of human resources/talent will continue	7	1	--	15	9	--
STATE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES						
State director is in the leadership role	8	0	--	16	8	--
One staff member has major responsibility for staff development/dissemination	7	1	--	19	5	--
A statewide representative advisory or planning committee exists	8	0	--	18	6	--
The area concept exists for SDE/university/local program cooperation	5	1	2	17	7	--
An area SDE supervisor has role in staff development	6	1	1	17	7	--
Area advisory or planning committees function	5	0	--	9	15	--

	State Directors			University Faculty		
	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable
1/3 to 1/2 fiscal support is given for faculty positions	3	5	--	10	14	--
A state plan for staff development/dissemination has been prepared for publication	8	0	--	21	3	--
Auxiliary support is given to university program (travel, materials, secretary, graduate student, etc.)	3	5	--	11	13	--
At least two inservice opportunities are offered annually for each teacher	8	0	--	21	3	--
Fiscal support is given to local trainers (teacher training, travel, fee, etc.)	3	5	--	16	8	--
A system for using local trainers in functioning	3	5	--	14	10	--
Support is given for professional development of state staff (travel, salary, etc.)	7	1	--	18	6	--
UNIVERSITY SERVICES						
A teacher-oriented graduate level curriculum exists	6	2	--	22	2	--
On-campus courses are offered	8	0	--	24	0	--
Off-campus courses are offered throughout the service area	7	1	--	22	2	--

	State Directors			University Faculty		
	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable	Yes, or yes in part	No	Not applicable
Consultant services are given to local programs	4	4	--	20	4	--
Non-credit instructional services are offered to SDE inservice/activities	7	1	--	20	4	--
Non-credit instructional services are offered to local programs/community	4	4	--	19	5	--
LOCAL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES						
Trained trainers are used	4	0	4	16	8	--
Participation on the input to state planning committee is possible	7	1	--	20	4	--
Communications link exists from teacher to decision maker	2	6	--	14	10	--

APPENDIX C: REGIONAL PROJECT PUBLICATIONS, 1969-1974

Annual reports

First Year Report, 1969-1970
Second Year Report, 1970-1971
Revitalizing Adult Basic Education (1971-1972)
Developing Systems To Spread Innovations in Adult Basic Education (1972-1973)
Dissemination in Adult Education: Using Region IV's Resources (1973-1974)

Evaluation reports

Evaluation Report: 1969-1972
Building and Using Staff Development Resources for Adult Education (1969-1974)

Seminar reports

Joint Conference Report, Daytona Beach, 1970
Seminar Report, New Orleans, 1970
Seminar Report, Stone Mountain, 1971
Seminar Report, Atlanta, 1972
Dissemination Process: Putting Experience To Work, Atlanta, 1973
Dissemination Process: Sharing Successes, Atlanta, 1974

Workshop reports and occasional papers

Readings in Staff Development, 1970
The Planning of In-Service Workshops, 1971
Proceedings of the Evaluation Seminar, 1970
Adult Basic Education Training Institute for Teachers of Blind and Visually Limited Adults, 1970
Adult Education and Adult Basic Education in America (William L. Bowden, 1971)
Overview To Work Scope, 1971
Dissemination Process: Exploring Alternatives, 1974

State plans

The Professional Staff Development Plans of Region IV, 1972
Plans for Staff Development and Dissemination in Adult Basic Education, 1974

Professional literature

Poverty: An Annotated Bibliography, 1970
A Model for Program Planning in Adult Education (James R. LaForest, 1973)
A Model for A Dissemination System, 1974